Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

Viniyamak Bhawan, 'C' Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi- 110 017

F.11 (1250)/DERC/2015-16

Petition No. 46/2015

Under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003

In the matter of:

Shri Harbhajan Singh,
73-A, Navyug Block,
Vishnu Garden,
New Delhi – 110018 **…….Complainant**

VERSUS

BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd.
Through its: **CEO**
BSES Bhawan
Nehru Place
New Delhi-110019 **……..Respondent**

Coram:
Sh. B.P. Singh, Member.

Appearance:

1. Petitioner in person
2. Shri V.K. Goel, Advocate of the Petitioner;
3. Shri Hardeep Singh, along with the Petitioner;
4. Shri Sarabjeet singh, along with the Petitioner;
5. Shri Aruj Mathur, Legal Manager, BRPL;
6. Shri Aditya Gupta, Advocate for Respondent;
7. Shri Ashish Verma, Advocate for Respondent;
8. Shri S. Bhattacharya, DGM Enforcement, BRPL.

INTERIM ORDER

(Date of Hearing: 13.04.2017)
(Date of Order: 24.04.2017)

1. The instant petition has been filed by Shri Harbhajan Singh, under Section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 against BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. for violation of the procedure as laid down in Regulations of the Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations, 2007.

2. The matter was listed for hearing in the Commission, which was attended by the Counsel/representatives of both the parties. Arguments and submissions from both the parties were made at length.

3. During the Hearing, the Counsel for the Petitioner reiterated its submissions made in the Petition and maintained that there had been violations like not providing any report at site or CD of videography done at site. It was further submitted that the Respondent failed to file a case against the consumer in the special court of electricity within 2 days from the date of inspection.

4. The Counsel for the Respondent clarified that all reports were prepared at site but the Consumer refused to sign and receive them. At the same time he did not allow it to be pasted at a conspicuous place in/outside the premises, therefore, the same was sent through speed post. The Counsel for the Respondent also provided proof viz. dispatch details of the reports. However, he admitted the fact that the Police complaint has not been lodged against the complainant within two days.

5. The Counsel for the Petitioner further submitted that no videography was done when the inspection was conducted as no proof to that effect has been provided by the Respondent.

6. On the issue of videography, the Counsel for the Respondent sought one week's time to supply a copy of the same.

7. The Commission accepted the prayer of the Respondent and granted one weeks time to supply a copy of Videography. The matter was adjourned.

8. The next date of hearing shall be intimated to the parties in due course.

9. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
(B. P. Singh)
Member